

rather than unbelief and high criticism
near the end of his course
 premillennialism. I remember there was one verse which a student ~~W~~ at Princeton said to me once; he said, "This is the primary verse for premillennialism." I had barely ~~heard~~ ^{heard} that particular verse and had never thought of it as an ~~argu~~ ^{argu} argument for anything. But he said, "This is the primary ~~verse~~ ^{verse} for premillennialism." At that time I had barely heard that particular verse and had never thought of it as an argument for anything. But he said, "This is the primary supporting verse for premillennialism," and plain exegesis shows ~~x~~ that that is not what it means *at all*.⁵⁰ And he became an amillennialist for one day and then became a postmillennialist. Years later I wrote a whole ~~xx~~ article on that verse. I believe that the only reasonable interpretation of that verse, James' remarks at the council in Acts 15 fits exactly with premillennialism, but I have never seen anywhere else a statement of just how ~~xxx~~ this is. At that time I had never heard the verse given as an argument for premillennialism, and I was shocked when this fellow said that it was the primary evidence for it. And he said, "Just plain exegesis shows that isn't what it means at all." The fellow became an amillennialist for one day and then became a postmillennialist.

Well, when that particular verse I was told that in a course in OT^o Interpretation in later years, out of half or three-fourths of the semester would be given by Dr. Allis to discussing that verse, as an argument against premillennialism, While ~~o tjoml jos~~ ^{it's a pity} exegesis was definitely wrong, worse than that was the waste of ~~time~~, in my opinion, of all that time which should have been spent in teaching sound sensible methods of interpreting Scripture. But, when he would say ~~something~~ ^{something} against the higher crit ~~about the higher criticism~~, students would nod; they knew it was all a lot of nonsense anyway, but when he ~~fw~~ would say speak about premillennialism they were interested and ~~xx~~ this stimulated him. And that was very unfortunate.

Dr. Armstrong ~~spoke~~ spoke in such a low tone that in a class of 60, maybe the eight nearest to ~~him~~ him could understand what he was saying. ~~The rest of the class~~ I don't know whether these eight paid much attention; I know that many in the class were studying for other courses or writing letters or doing other things rather than paying much attention to him. He had a lot of very ~~valau~~ ^{valuable} valuable material, if only he ~~he~~ had given it in a way that was easy to get. When I began the third year I went to the person who assigns seats and said I had difficulty understanding Dr. Armstrong and Dr. Voss (?) and requested that I be given a seat on the front row. He did that and then when the seating was posted Dr. Stonehouse noticed it; he was not then a doctor, and he ~~went~~ ^{went} and asked to be put in the front row in all classes--which was done. ^{in this class} In Dr. ARMstrong's ~~xxx~~ course--when he would tell a joke he would look at the two of us because he knew we were listening. (Dr. Machen said that everything he knew he got from Dr. Armstrong. I believe this was a great hyperbole, but I would trust Dr. Machen's judgment that Dr. Armstrong had a great deal of valuable extremely valuable material and also the statement that he was excellent at wording it.) Unfortunagely